

OK92 ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ NATIONAL CAUCUS OF  
Approved For Release 2005/01/11 : CIA-RDP88-01315R000300590068-4 Labor Committee

# The Guardian rushes on where Engels refused to tread

DAILY WORLD  
19 APRIL 1973

By RICK NACIN

In addition to falsely charging at a recent Guardian forum that the Communist Party supports the Lon Nol regime in Cambodia, Mike Klonsky misrepresented the Communist Party's position on the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism.

Klonsky denies there is such a possibility and claims that the CP holds it to be the only possibility. He is wrong on both counts.

To support his contention Klonsky read one sentence from the CP Program, which stated: "Of course, we advocate social change by peaceful means, through political institutions and people's organizations within the American Constitutional framework."

Taken by itself, the sentence could leave the impression Klonsky wished, but the very next sentence states: "But the people's democratic will, our advocacy, and the democratic institutions of our country are not the sole historical factors that will determine the path of social change in the United States."

The Program goes on to say: "The people must be prepared to meet any eventuality. While we seek a peaceful path, as preferable to a violent one, this choice may prove to be blocked by monopolist reaction. Socialism must be sought, therefore, by whatever means circumstances may impose."

The question of violence or any form of struggle is a question of tactics, which can only be determined by examining concrete situations and, in particular, by determining the forms of struggle accepted by the broad masses of the people as necessary. In general, people will always seek the less violent methods before resorting to more violent ones.

Klonsky and Irwin Silber, however, elevated "armed struggle" to the level of a principle, evidently based on Chairman Mao's saying that "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun."

"The working class must prepare for armed struggle," Silber urged, though he did not say whether this should be introduced as a resolution to trade unions or should be adopted by the strikers at the Farah pants plant.

Perhaps Silber is only romantically

associating himself with armed struggle "in principle" and does not mean this to be taken seriously in any concrete situation. If so, this is the height of irresponsibility, as too many gifted, dedicated people have already died partly because of such "general" calls to "pick up the gun."

When coupled with Klonsky's and Silber's view that workers should look to Black people for leadership in the struggle, such calls to armed struggle or even preparation for it have a decidedly racist character.

Perhaps, the new Maoists are only speaking of some undefined future date when socialism is on the order of the day. Yet, they object to the Communist Party's recognition that even under such conditions a peaceful transition may be possible.

However, the view that a revolution is impossible without violence is strictly contrary to Marxist theory. The founders of Marxism-Leninism were very clear on this question and, even on the eve of the Bolshevik revolution, Lenin held that a peaceful transition was still possible.

Under present world conditions the possibility of a relatively peaceful revolution is even greater than during the lives of Marx, Engels and Lenin. This is because the anti-imperialist forces in the world today, when they are united, now outweigh the forces of imperialism and may be able to block ruling class attempts to drown a revolution in blood.

It is exactly in this context that the danger of Maoism and other divisive forms of narrow nationalism and middle class radicalism lies. These forces vacillate and at any moment may line up with the basic anti-Soviet, anti-Communist, anti-democratic thrust of U.S. imperialism.

The latest example of this line-up is, in fact, the effort to form a Maoist party in the U.S., a "new communist party." The Chinese Maoists are actively involved in this and the U.S. government would, at the very least, welcome any effort to counter the growing influence of the Communist Party.

In the recent period nearly all the groups involved in the Guardian forum

have sent delegations to China to confer with important officials of the Chinese CP.

The leaders of one of these groups, the Puerto Rican Revolutionary Workers Organization (formerly the Young Lords), were interviewed recently by the New York Post (March 23). Pablo (Yoruba) Guzman, a member of the PRWO central committee, described his meeting with the Chinese:

"I sat down with some comrades and gave them a report on the situation in the U.S.," he said. The Chinese Communists criticized the Lords for their 'lumpen' orientation and for their belaboring of the issue of independence for Puerto Rico.

"We had made a lot of errors," said a chastened Yoruba. Since the formation of the new organization last July, PRWO has closed down its independentista operation in Puerto Rico and dropped its radical Puerto Rican nationalist stance.

"They see their task now as the creation of a 'multi-national' communist party — drawing in workers from all ethnic groups and nationalities — to replace the 'sold out' U.S. Communist Party."

Thus U.S. monopoly capital has a new ally in its more than 50-year effort to remove the Communist party from the scene, an ally whose mission is to form an anti-Communist force within the U.S. left. There is an effort to launch several such groups, including the CIA-ultra directed National Caucus of Labor Committees, which recently began a series of goon squad attacks in pursuance of "an exact tactical plan... to finish off the Communist Party."

The vast majority of the U.S. left, including most readers of the Guardian, would prefer to see unity of all opposed to racism, exploitation and war. Then, clearly, it would be possible to hasten the day when the criminal imperialist system is finally buried.

Unfortunately, the Guardian, the Maoist groups hovering around it and the various other anti-Communist "left" sects seem committed to a course that constitutes an attack on left unity and can only drive working people away from radical ideas and the fight against monopoly.